DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 670 UD 021 008

AUTHOR Thomas, Theodore H.
TITLE Ethical and Value Dilemmas in Urban Management Performance.
INSTITUTION University of Southern California, Los Angeles. School of Public Administration.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C. Office of Policy Development and Research.; National Training and Development Service for State and Local Government, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 47p.; For related documents see UD 020 926-937 and UD 021 002-009.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Decision Making; Ethical Instruction; *Ethics; *Inservice Education; *Management Development; Moral Development; *Moral Values; Postsecondary Education; Professional Continuing Education; Public Administration Education; *Urban Areas; Values Clarification; Workshops

ABSTRACT

This module represents one portion of the National Training and Development Service Urban Management Curriculum Development Project. It focuses on the issue of ethics in urban management performance and is designed to demonstrate that ethical dilemmas are a personal, complex, everyday managerial problem, and to enlarge the range of ethical options available to individuals. Participants are expected to complete seven activities, some independently and some in group sessions. Activities include pre and post workshop evaluations, an ethical dilemma questionnaire, a values confrontation game, a discussion of approaches to ethical behavior choices, a decisional strategy exercise, and a personal case analysis. The materials included in this module are for both the instructor and the participants. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED194670

ETHICAL AND VALUE DILEMMAS IN URBAN MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE

Developed by

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Theodore H. Thomas, Principal Developer

Under Contract to

THE URBAN MANAGEMENT CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

THE NATIONAL TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

5028 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20016

Funded by

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

UD021008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Package XVII

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL OVERVIEW		XVII.1.3
GOALS		XVII.1.4
MODULE DEVELOPMENT		XVII.1.5
INSTRUCTOR PREREQUISITES		XVII.1.6
GENERAL DESCRIPTION		XVII.1.7
DESIGN SUGGESTIONS		XVII.1.8
ACTIVITY ONE:	A Pre-Session Evaluation	XVII.1.9
ACTIVITY TWO:	The Ethical Dilemma Questionnaire	XVII.1.12
ACTIVITY THREE:	Values Confrontation Games	XVII.1.16
ACTIVITY FOUR:	Action Approaches to Ethical Behavior Choices	XVII.1.24
ACTIVITY FIVE:	A Decisional Strategy for Ethical Quandaries	XVII.1.34
ACTIVITY SIX:	A Personal Case Analysis	XVII.1.37
ACTIVITY SEVEN:	A Post-Session Evaluation	XVII.1.39
Appendix A	Supplementary Bibliography	XVII.1.41
Appendix B	Some Illustrative Cases	XVII.1.43

GENERAL OVERVIEW

The ethical complexities of urban management performance are a continuing concern for everyone in our society--citizens who are also clients of public organizations, political and managerial leaders of these organizations, and, most especially for our present purposes, the internal membership, professional staff and professional managers.

Career managers are daily bombarded by wide ranging, often conflicting signals for appropriate behavior. In a variety of ways, the organizational member is caught in dilemmas which are either deliberately or unconsciously avoided. Many of these dilemmas contribute to managerial stress, anxiety, disappointments and destructive confrontations. Unsuccessful resolution of ethical dilemmas leads to managerial stress and stagnation, as well as to coping mechanisms which produce informal organizational norms like humorous discussion of unethical conduct, indirect personal attacks and rumor milling, and CYA behavior. In short, ethical dilemmas for managers are daily, pervasive, troublesome aspects of urban government performance.

Very little attention is given this general subject area in either public management educational programs or in organizational practice. This workshop in ethical and value dilemmas is one attempt to explore managerial ethical dilemmas and to search for coping mechanisms more personally effective than those of avoidance, "swallowing it," or getting fired.

The issue of ethics in public life can be explored from different frames of reference. Ethical issues from the societal perspective are involved in such problems as euthanasia, the death penalty, the right to die or "pull the plug," privacy, secrecy, and the like. From a different frame of reference, that of the public organization, a different category of ethical issues is evident--wire-tapping, mail-opening, blacklisting, kidney machine utilization and other health service priority problems, secrecy in personnel records and actions, and weapons procedures and utilization in police work.

The individual member in the organization poses a third frame of reference from which the ethics questions can be addressed. "What shall I do" is the question which individuals confront under conditions of conflicting standards for behavior coming from the law, from hierarchical superiors, from professional standards, from peers, and from their own personal ethical systems. It is this individual category of ethical dilemma with which this module is primarily concerned.

GOALS

The workshop is designed to assist the participant toward greater understanding of the ethical confrontations of daily life and toward more personally effective behavioral choices in response to those confrontations.

Stated differently, this workshop is designed:

a) to demonstrate that ethical dilemmas are an intensely personal, deeply complex, everyday managerial problem; and,

b) to enlarge or expand the range of personally believable, personally effective, ethical options for action.

A useful first step in improving ethical performance in the public service is to insure that the ethical standards professed by American public managers are consistently represented in the behavior of those managers. We believe that, at the present, professed ethical standards are significantly "higher" and/or "better" than the behavior. Although this may not ultimately be the most critical point of attack on the issue of public ethics, it is a reasonable, manageable, and effective first step. We assume the existence of a high standard of ethics, and then in this workshop encourage public servants to perform in accordance with those high standards.

It is also apparent that ethical standards are not translated into consistent, complementary behavior choices in individual action situations. We may agree, for example, on the standard against stealing but we do not agree on what actions represent stealing (e.g., taking office pencils home, using the business phone for personal calls, fudging on the IRS forms, or following the letter of the law for personal or organizational advantage when we agree that the spirit of the law intends otherwise!).

The assumptions underlying the activities suggested for this workshop, therefore, are premised on the idea that teachers and managers can best enhance the quality of ethical performance by opening the way for the personal expression of ethically consistent behavior. This can be done by seeking structural innovations that increase those incentives which reward ethical behavior and that minimize disincentives which deter ethical behavior.

It is readily apparent than an objective of encouraging public servants to behave more consistently with their own existing ethical standards is not the whole story nor the entire challenge to ethical performance in the public service. There are serious, troublesome questions of legal definitions of appropriate public action. Even more troublesome and far more subtle are lapses in public performance resulting from pessimism and cynicism which Stephen Bailey has suggested

leads to "cynical games of manipulation, personal aggrandizement, and parasitic security." The focus on getting the best from what we now have in the personal ethical conceptions of American public servants represented in these workshop activities should not be allowed to obscure additional ethical dilemmas in the management of the public sector. But the individual focus is one starting point which may well lead toward new and constructive approaches to broader organizational and societal questions.

MODULE DEVELOPMENT

This exploration in ethical behavior problems of urban managers has developed out of a three year, continuing interaction between the module developer and a wide variety of public citizens, professional public managers, public administration students and faculty in Southern California.

Initially, the module developer collaborated with Jerome Seliger and Harlan Hobgood in a series of workshops called "Ethics and Government--What Can The Citizen Do?" sponsored by University of California Extension. Early forms of some of the exercises used in the present module originated with that series. Since that time the general question of managerial ethics and the exercises encompassed in this module have been explored with a variety of classes and seminars at the University of Southern California and in one special class in "Wilderness and Values," offered by the Boojum Institute of San Diego and the Department of Recreation at San Diego State University.

During this module development year, with the support of NTDS and HUD, the materials and exercises have been sought and refined in a wide range of interactions with public administration classes, the Environmental Management Institute and the Delinquency Control Institute at USC, and especially with the Municipal Management Assistants of Southern California (MMASC). With MMASC the module developer has helped to design a one-day workshop on managerial ethics and an additional one-half day workshop on resolving ethical dilemmas. Additional testing of parts of the module were done with graduate public administration classes at the University of California, Riverside, and Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh. Other tests have been done by Margaret Gibbs at California State University, San Bernadino; Louis Gawthrop at the State University of New York, Binghamton; and Ann-Marie Rizzo at Florida International University, Miami.

Helpful evaluations and critiques have been made by Keith Mulrooney, Executive Director, American Society for Public Administration; Ken Wilson, Southern California Edison Company; and David Hartl, Center for Training and Development, University of Southern California. Both Keith Mulrooney and Ken Wilson have used parts of the module in public administration classes.

INSTRUCTOR PREREQUISITES

This module has been designed to be virtually self-administering. There is no assumption of a correct "ethical" stance which an instructor or teacher or workshop leader should hold and then dispense to student-participants.

All materials and all instructions are to be equally available to all participants. Conceivably leaderless workshop sessions could utilize the materials and the module. For workshops and classes with leaders or instructors, therefore, there is no requirement for specialized competence in the fields of public service ethics or values.

A workshop leader or classroom instructor should have, however, a capacity for managing groups in exercises and games, for stimulating and guiding discussion, and for sensitive handling of complicated and ambiguous subject matter.

The module can be administered easily by one person in groups up to approximately 35. Separate discussion leaders and plenary groups might be useful above 35 participants.

STUDENT PREREQUISITES

This module is specifically targeted for in-service managers but should be appropriate for use with pre-service students. In other words, experience with conflicting standards for behavior in formal organizations is a useful but not a required prerequisite for participation. There are no prerequisite expectations for educational level, degrees, or academic majors.

THE SETTING

Module activity should be conducted in a room that feels large and comfortable for the size of group participating. There should be tables and chairs for all participants; mobility of the furniture for groupings of two to three, five to seven, and total group; chalkboards and/or flip charts, along with masking tape, marking pens, and wall space conducive to hanging newsprint for display.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The module is designed for group interaction time of four to twelve hours and outside time of approximately 24 hours for reading, reflection, and writing if being used for credit course work. Much of the learning comes from peer interactions; therefore, it is desirable to organize for nine to twelve hours of group time. Two days in workshop settings or a sequence of shorter classroom meetings is possible.

The following seven activities are recommended:

Activity One	A Pre-session Evaluation	1/3 - 1/2 hours
Activity Two	The Ethical Dilemmas Questionnaire	1-1/2 - 2 hours
Activity Three	The Values Confrontation Game	1-1/2 - 2 hours
Activity Four	Action Approaches to Ethical Behavior Choices	1-1/2 - 2 hours
Activity Five	Decisional Strategy Exercise	2 - 2-1/2 hours
Activity Six	Personal Case Analysis	2 hours
Activity Seven	A Post-Session Evaluation	Unlimited

Activities Four, Six and Seven are most easily done independently, outside of group sessions. Activity Four requires reading reflection. Group discussion is valuable but not absolutely necessary. Activity Six requires individual writing and analysis of a personal case, leading to a statement of a personal philosopny or code of ethical behavior. Again, discussion is valuable but not necessary.

Activity Seven, the post evaluation is best done by means of a diary-like reflection on the meaning of the experience to the individual and on the methodology and format of the experience. It is preferably submitted to some third party or group rather than directly to the workshop director or teacher. Participants should be asked at the beginning to note some personal reflections on the experience after each day's segment.

DESIGN SUGGESTIONS

The experience derived from the use of this module and its mini-modules components has provided a few lessons perhaps useful to those who are designing workshops or courses. Three things in particular seem to be most important:

1) You should be very flexible in adapting these suggested activities to the program you are designing. Do not treat the design of activities and time suggested for each as a rigid schedule to be followed. The best results come from self-learning discoveries by those participating. These discoveries may come in different ways and unexpected times. The instructor should allow "discovery" moments to flourish, and curtail or omit other activities as necessary.

2) Pick and choose carefully among the mini-modules if time does not permit use of the full module. Activity Two, the questionnaire, for instance, is very valuable when used with the entire module. Participants quickly grasp the elements of personal organizational dilemmas and are stimulated to contribute personal experience cases. Used alone, however, Activity Two provides little sense of resolution or closure, leaving participants feeling they have experienced only the obvious and have learned little.

If you have only a limited time, perhaps three to four hours of group contact time, Activity Two's Questionnaire followed by Activity Five's Decisional Strategy exercise may be best. In this case, be sure to include the writing of some personal case statements when concluding the questionnaire discussion. These personal cases can then be used as examples for the Decisional Strategy Exercise.

3) The use of "live" personal cases generated from workshop participants is an important factor in generating realism. The choices available for resolving ethical conflicts are perceived differently by those in the eye of the dilemma and others who are emotionally and physically distant from the issue. Thus the interaction among participants seeking constructive and ethical action possibilities is greatly enhanced when the subject of the ethical conflict can provide an "eyewitness" account.

If the full module is being used, for instance, it may be beneficial to have participants contribute the personal case reflections suggested in Activity Six prior to doing the Decisional Exercise in Activity Five. Group analysis and discussion in Activity Five normally provides excellent examples of both typical and creative approaches to resolving ethical dilemmas. Participants are able to discriminate between the two and to use this learning in the preparation of the personal analysis and personal code required in Activity Six.

ACTIVITY ONE

A Pre-Session Evaluation

When beginning this exploration in ethical and value dilemmas of urban managers, it will be helpful to reflect on our beginning understandings of what public ethics is all about, what we believe the problems seem to be, and what we think might or ought to be done about the situations we perceive.

Please spend a few minutes writing out some responses to the following questions. The pre-session evaluation is for your own benefit in comparing what you think now with what you may understand when you complete the modular activity. Keep your responses in a safe place in order that you may make the before-and-after comparison when we have finished.

1. Have you ever experienced a conflict between your personal conception of ethical behavior and what your organization or your superior expects of you?

Never ( ) Rarely ( ) Regularly ( ) Often ( )

If other than Never, briefly list a few illustrations.

2. On a scale of 1 (low) to 10 (high), how would you rate:

a) the quality of ethical behavior of career public managers in the United States today?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

b) the quality of ethical behavior in the public organization with which you are most familiar?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

c) the quality level of your own ethical behavior in the organizational environment (non-family)?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

3. List three specific things which you think are unethical about the way public managers regularly behave.

4. List three things you do often in your professional life about which you feel guilty or uncomfortable?

5. Please describe a personal ethical conflict or situation you would like to work on or get some answers to during this workshop.

6. List three or four specific things that you believe could be done in public organizations in order to achieve a higher level of ethical performance.

ACTIVITY TWO

Time: Approximately two hours.

The Ethical Dilemma Questionnaire

A. Instructions	Approximate Time
1. Turn to the Questionnaire on Page 13, read each of the items, and then record your response in the appropriate place on the Answer Sheet on the following page.	10 minutes
2. Divide the group into dyads or triads to compare responses and to discern how and why any disagreement has occurred.	20 minutes
3. Each group should choose one item felt to be most complex or most challenging as a dilemma for public managers. Prepare to lead a discussion on this item with the larger group.	5 minutes
4. In plenary-session, review several of the small group deliberations.	20-30 minutes
5. In dyads or triads again, contribute some personally known ethical dilemma situations, phrased in similar fashion to those of the questionnaire.	10-15 minutes
6. In plenary session, report and discuss the personally contributed cases.	45 minutes

7. It is expected that this exercise will result in

a) differing assumptions about factual conditions which have not been identified in the statement; and,

b) varying definitions about when a particular action falls into either an unethical or illegal category.

8. Discussion questions--Does your experience in doing this exercise coincide with the expectation? Are there other discoveries that come from the exercise? What can you say about the challenge of achieving ethical performance in public management as a result of this exercise?

B. Questionnaire

Record your responses on the answer sheet provided:

1. The police officer is justified in carrying out the Chief's order to release without arrest the Mayor's drunk driving daughter.

2. The emergency room nurse acts appropriately when he/she against hospital procedure and state law, orders X-rays of a battered child when the physician on call is not available.

3. A manager acts appropriately in writing a "selectively worded" but positive recommendation in order to transfer a troublesome employee to another department.

4. Your superior requests a negative evaluation of one of your subordinates in order to expedite the dismissal. You do not oppose the dismissal but find the requested negative evaluation to be "stretching the truth" quite a bit. You act appropriately in writing the negative evaluation.

5. Your superior orders you to dismiss a subordinate whom you regard as capable and promising but who committed an "error in judgment" causing an adverse public reaction. You act appropriately in carrying out the superior's order.

6. At a convention of legislators and city managers, a city manager is justified in picking up the dinner tab for a group of council members and guests who (including you) have just finished an excellent and expensive meal complete with several bottles of "good vintage" French wines.

7. Public officials are justified in using publicly owned or leased automobiles for personal use "within reason" as extra-compensation for inadequate salaries and allowances despite legal restrictions for official use only.

8. As the affirmative action representative for your organization, you are justified in "tipping" the EEOC and FEPC of your belief that the organization is violating its affirmative action responsibilities.

9. It is appropriate for an examiner to rate a minority candidate higher than otherwise justified in order to compensate for another examiner's bias against that minority.

10. You act appropriately in extending the filing deadline for a job opening at the request of an influential legislator whose personal friend wished to file but has been out of the city.

11. A superior acts appropriately in avoiding termination or correction of a well-liked minority employee who is known to be shirking a fair share of the workload (apparently acting to avoid "discrimination" charges against the agency).

12. You act appropriately in not interfering with a superior's attempt to force resignation of one of your female staff members who is highly qualified and performing satisfactorily but has allegedly contributed to the marriage failure of a male member of your staff.

C. Answer Sheet

Check the appropriate agree or disagree box for each statement; or check one of the three other alternatives. If either alternative D or E is chosen, please describe briefly your conditions or reservations.

	Agree	Disagree	Abstain for lack of firm position	Have another point of view	Abstain for other reasons
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
1.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

ACTIVITY THREE

Values Confrontation Games

1. Values confrontation games are useful for demonstrating both the variety of ways we evaluate the actions of others and the complexity of facts, assumptions, and perceived motives involved in human and organizational interactions.

The two games suggested here for possible use vivdly demonstrate these characteristics. You should choose one of them for use in a confrontation exercise. Our experience suggests that you should not use both games, at least not sequentially during the same session.

The Passive Island game is more professionally relevant to public managers and demonstrates quite well the paradoxes of legislative and administrative procedures, the power as well as the limitations of professional criteria for performance, and "normal" expressions of human personality. The story is based on a recent, actual episode in a medium-sized suburban California city.

The Raging River game is adapted from an often used training exercise which is guaranteed to produce a stimulating, provocative group interaction. It is not, however, directly administratively relevant and does, for some, involve a sensitive and inappropriately sexist scenario. The game has been used successfully with hundreds of students and professional managers; nevertheless, each instructor should consider carefully which game seems more appropriate for the context in which it will be used.

2. For playing either game, have available several sheets of newsprint, several marking pens, masking tape, and some available, tapable wall space.

3. Using a blackboard or newprint for the diagram, relate the scenario from either the Passive Island or the Raging River game.

4. Each participant should individually rank each of the five characters in the scenario from "like most" to "like least." (three minutes)

5. In groups of five to seven members, discuss the story and then agree on a group ranking of "like most" to "like least" along with the reasons for the ranking. The results should be placed on a newsprint sheet for sharing with all others, preferably using a diagram like the following:

Person	Reasons

Approximately 25-30 minutes

6. In plenary session, discuss each group's conclusion and how the decision was reached. One representative from each group might present that group's conclusions.

Approximately 10-15 minutes.

7. Turn to the Debriefing Chart on page 20.

a) In Item I, record the original individual ranking.

b) In Item II, describe each character in two different ways--first, as how you feel about or value the person's behavior; and second, in terms with which that person being described would agree. What is the difference between the two columns?

Is there relative consensus among the participants in this exercise regarding the terms used in one column and dissensus regarding the other? If so, which is which? If so, why?

c) For Item III, list as many words as you can to describe the values represented by the person's behavior.

d) For Item IV, list a number of terms which you would like to think represent your personal values and rank order them on a scale of more to less valued--or in terms of those which you would choose if faced with an apparently irreconcilable conflict of some with others.

Do you perceive any semblance of what might be called a hierarchy of values?

e) For Item V, respond to the following:

(1) If you were a member of a personnel selection board, which of the five characters would you nominate for a city managership? Which would you rank second?

(2) If you were a member of a personnel selection board, which of the five characters would you nominate for a position as teacher of 12th grade civics?

(3) Which of the five characters would you most likely choose to be a close personal friend?

(4) Does the purpose of the evaluation change or affect the value of "like most"?

f) For Item IV, record your personal ranking of the five characters after the discussion and the debriefing. Have you changed your mind at all? If so, why? Does new information or new group generated perspectives justify what might be called inconsistent or unprincipled conduct?

8. If time permits, the debriefing can consider some additional items:

a) Most groups reach common conclusions by means of extracting some compromise from each member of the group. Participants should be asked to speculate about and comment on the compromising of personal value choices involved in reaching a group decision.

b) Virtually no one playing these games refuses to participate on groundsof personal principle . Some later say it is only a game or not important enough to refuse to go along with normal political negotiation and compromise. But some discussion might center on the right of civil disobedience and the difficulty of establishing the line for the "important enough" determination.

c) The game process itself resembles to some degree the representative government process. This can be highlighted by asking each group to send a representative to a new representative council to achieve a class or workshop consensus on the ranking of the five characters.

The Passive Island Game

City Manager – City Attorney – Mayor – Councilman – Editor

There once was an island in the middle of a small city in Southwestern United States. The island is an unincorporated area entirely surrounded by the corporate territory of the city. Several years ago it had been a blighted neighborhood of shanties and unpaved alleys, but a redevelopment project sponsored by the county government has changed the island to new middle-income housing, a park, and some commerical-industrial space.

Our small city decided to seek annexation of the island territory, and proceeds to the necessary study and reporting procedure, the adoption of a resolution of intent to annex, the scheduling of a public hearing--all in preparation for the final resolution of annexation. Under state law, no election procedure is required if the territory to be annexed contains fewer than twelve registered voters.

After the resolution of intent is passed and the public hearing is held, it is discovered that there are exactly twelve registered voters in the island. The new situation would appear to require a formal election procedure involving both the citizens of the island and the city and requiring a much more elaborate set of procedures, at least an additional year, and considerably greater public expense.

The City Manager consults the City Attorney who provides a written opinion that a) the non-election procedure would be valid if there were not twelve registered voters on the date of the intent resolution, or b) the non-election procedure would still be valid if the number of registered voters dropped below twelve before the final annexing resolution was adopted.

The Manager recommends to the Mayor the strategy of seeking or encouraging the deregistration of one or more votes in the island, knowing that one family has put its home up for sale and has opened escrow on the purchase of a home in another city. The Mayor does not discourage the Manager but later relates the plan to a Councilman who objects in rather vivid language to the idea. Neither the Mayor nor the Councilman talk to the Manager about Councilman's reaction.

The same evening the Councilman writes and mails a letter to the Editor, in which he tells of the plan and accuses the Manager and the Attorney of "unpatriotic, subversive, and anti-American" activity. The Editor, who is personally acquainted with all four other actors in this story, prints the letter without calling or telling anyone.

The Raging River Game

There is a raging river which can be crossed only by means of a boat. The only boat is owned and operated by a person we shall call A (in order to protect the innocent as well as the guilty). On the same side of the River is a person, X, who is deeply and sincerely in love with a person C on the other side of the River. X goes to A asking to be taken across the River, offering to pay whatever the charge for the service. A declines any money, but agrees to take X across the River if X will sleep with A. Person X refuses, of course (!), but argues and then pleads with A to name some other price. A, however, remains firm.

Person X leaves but returns a second day to seek a way across the River. A remains as adamant as before. In frustration, X seeks out a third person, B, who hears the situation sympathetically, agreeing that A is certainly a rougue. But B says, "I have other matters concerning me just now and am not able to help you."

In desperation X goes to A a third time only to be met with the same offer for the trip across the River. X finally agreed to the price and sleeps with A who then delivers X across the River as promised.

X and C are joyously reunited, until C asks how X got across the River. X truthfully replies, "I had to sleep with A to earn the trip across the River." C replies indignantly, "Out of my life!! I will have nothing to do with one who holds honor and principle so lightly!"

X, of course, is frustrated and desperate again, and appeals to Person D who replies, "I understand and am deeply sympathetic. I'd do anything I can to help you." (The curtain falls.)

Debriefing Chart

I.

II.
Describe each person in terms acceptable to that person

Describe each person as you value that person's behavior.

1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

III.
List values represented by each person's behavior

IV.
How would you rank values like those you list in Figure III from more valued to less valued?

More Valued	
Less Valued	

V. (1) a) _____ b) _____

(2) a) _____ b) _____

(3) a) _____ b) _____

VI. 1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

ACTIVITY FOUR

Action Approaches to Ethical Behavior Choices

A. The following essay briefly introduces some of the practical suggestions for managers to use in evaluating the ethical component of action choices. The essay is merely an introduction to the ideas and concepts of concerned executives and authors whose work is available in more detailed form in articles referenced at the end. Whenever the Seminar is held in short segments over a period of time, participants are urged to read the referenced material directly. Even if it is not possible to read these sources during the Seminar, it is recommended that they be read either before or after the Seminar.

B. An hour to two hours of seminar time should be devoted to examination of the concepts represented in the essay below. During a two day intensive seminar encompassing the entire modular activity, participants should take twenty to thirty minutes to read the essay itself, perhaps utilizing a long lunch hour or an extended break period. The discussion could take place in a traditional lecture-discussion format in plenary session; or small groups of five to seven might first examine the issues and contribute discussion questions for a plenary session to follow. The following questions might serve to stimulate the discussion:

1) Do the recommended approaches deal directly and effectively with the kinds of managerial dilemmas exposed in Activities Two and Three?

2) Is it appropriate to focus on "ethical" people caught in situations not of their own making rather than on those who do the "wrong"?

3) What are the dangers involved in using public scrutiny as an ethical yardstick?

4) Do you agree that the public service has its unique rewards over those of private business--that is, psychic rewards compensating for financial rewards?

5) Do you agree that higher standards of conduct are required of public servants over those required of non-public employees?

a) If so, what specific and unique standards are required of the public servant?

b) If not, where do we look for controls over individualistic, entrepreneurial, self-interested behavior in both the public and the private service?

C. Approaches to Ethical Behavior

Much of the writing on public ethics has as its concern the institutional aspects of ethical questions, those that provide the imponderables of social policy questions and those that evaluate the correctness of organizational policies and procedures. Much less attention has focused on the individual context, the realm of the daily quandary faced by high level executives as well as those working in the lower and middle levels of public management.

The manager is sometimes described as one who has to make hard choices among a variety of competing demands. Those choices require the resolution of conflicting expectations. When some of those expectations spring from the manager's personal conception of "right" and are seen to be conflicting with perhaps very powerful alternative commands, the decision maker is caught in an ethical dilemma.

There is no denying the importance of institutional ethical problems, yet it is at least equally important to deal with the individual dilemma of the everyday manager. This essay reviews the outlines of a few suggestions for how public managers may think about and then act on ethically-charged situations.

Harlan Cleveland has described some of the difficulty in dealing with ethical issues affecting the individual manager. We begin, he suggests, to learn our notions of ethical responsibility in our early environment, in our childhood and the home and school and church. From these myriad sources, we continue to expand our ethical consciousness through organizational experience, personal friendships, travel, literature, and the like.

> Then as we gain more experience, we develop our personal notions from the injustices we see practiced or find we are practicing ourselves, from the examples we see of social and antisocial behavior, from reading and listening, from experimenting with personal leadership. After a while, each person's ethical system is at least a little different from anyone else's.

If each of us has a personal ethical system, differing from everyone else, perhaps like a fingerprint, the problem of determining and achieving ethical behavior becomes rather complicated and difficult.

One approach to getting a handle on this difficult problem is to focus on those who "know" or "believe" in an ethical posture but then either fail to act in defense of that posture or who act against that which is personally believed to be right. In the former case for example we see "wrong" being done in the organization around us and do nothing to intervene, for whatever reasons (many of which may be very good and

often compelling,others of which are less compelling). In the latter case, we often are ordered or feel pressured to do things against our better ethical judgment and we opt in effect for the "unethical."

This suggested focus on ethical behavior skirts the problem of those who do the "bad," the wrong, or the illegal. Briefly indicated, there are two reasons for skirting the "wrong-doers." One is that there is significant difficulty in our modern complex society in determining what is the illegal or the wrong or the unethical act. The second is that the variety of ways in which we normally deal with wrong-doers achieves dubious results. We tend to tell others to do the right. We tend to control wrong-doers by the use of rules, regulations, policemen, spies, directors and auditors, fines and penalties. And we tend to rely on "teaching" others what the right is and what the right thing to do is.

For our present purposes the challenge of unethical behavior will be seen essentially as the failure of many of us at some time or another to act in conformance with our own perceptions of an ethical response. This, of course, is not the entire problem, but it may be in one sense a more readily and immediately manageable piece of the much larger, more complicated societal problem.

One of Stephen Bailey's suggestions is useful for extending the definition of the individual's ethical challenge. He suggests that personal ethics in the public service is made up of a combination of three mental attitudes and three moral qualities. The mental attitudes are:

a) recognition of the moral ambiguity of all men and of all public policies;

b) recognition of the contextual forces conditioning moral priorities in the public service; and,

c) recognition of the paradoxes of procedures.

The moral qualities are:

a) optimism;

b) courage; and,

c) fairness tempered by charity.

It may be possible to recognize the substance of the first three categories in the illustrations and cases explored in Activities Two and Three. It remains for the succeeding activities to seek the meaning and personal resources for the three moral qualities.

The following paragraphs outline some practical recommendations for seeking resolution of ethical dilemmas.

The International City Management Association has for many years promulgated and monitored the ICMA Code of Ethics:

"1. Be dedicated to the concepts of effective and democratic local government by responsible elected officials and believe that professional general management is essential to the achievement of this objective.

2. Affirm the dignity and worth of the services rendered by government and maintain a constructive, creative, and practical attitude toward urban affairs and a deep sense of his social responsibility as a trusted public servant.

3. Dedicate himself to the highest ideals of honor and integrity in all public and personal relationships in order that he may merit the respect and confidence of the elected officials of other officials and employees, and of the public which he serves.

4. Recognize that the chief function of local government at all times is to serve the best interests of all of the people.

5. Submit policy proposals to elected officials, provide them with the facts and advice on matters of policy as a basis for making decisions and setting community goals, and uphold and implement municipal policies adopted by elected officals.

6. Recognize that elected representatives of the people are entitled to the credit for the establishment of municipal policies; responsibility for policy execution rests with the member.

7. Refrain from participation in the election of the members of his employing legislative body, and from all partisan political activities which would impair his performance as a professional administrator.

8. Make it his duty continually to improve his ability and to develop the competence of his associates in the use of management techniques.

9. Keep the community informed on municipal affairs; encourage communication between the citizens and all municipal officers; emphasize friendly and courteous service to the public; and seek to improve the quality and image of the public service.

10. Resist any encroachment on his responsibilities, believing he should be free to carry out official policies without interference, and handle each problem without discrimination on the basis of principle and justice.

11. Handle all matters of personnel on the basis of merit so that fairness and impartiality govern his decisions pertaining to appointments, pay adjustments, promotions, and discipline.

12. Seek no favor; believe that personal aggrandisement or profit secured by confidential information or by misuse of public time is dishonest."

The ICMA Code is long standing and is apparently a highly respected guide for the members of the profession. The ICMA takes the Code seriously, monitors and revises the Code as necessary, and acts to enforce its provisions through the activities of the ICMA Executive Board and the Ethics Committee. The Code is backed up by the ICMA Constitution which prescribes a code for the organization, by the Statement of Policy and Rules of Procedures for enforcement, and by a set of Guidelines for Professional Conduct which provides illustrations of both permitted and proscribed activity.

Another set of ethical guidelines fitting a prescriptive definition is that offered by George Graham and published in the Public Administration Review. Graham divides the areas for guidelines into three categories:

a) guidelines for in-putting or contributing to the formulation of decisions;

b) the limits of compromise in decision process; and

c) guidelines for performance in the implementation process.

Quoted below are only a few of the suggestions offered by Graham which he intends as a stimulus to discussion in the public administration fraternity on the subject of ethics. The reader should, if possible, consult the complete draft of the original statement in order to avoid any out of context interpretations. Some of the Graham guidelines are:

1. "Inform others participating in the decision-making process (supervisors, peers, subordinates) of significant information which is properly relevant to their role in the decision."

2. "Interpret the data, explain their meaning, and argue the case for their impact on policy as he sees it, while making sure he has no personal conflict of interest, and at the same time revealing the value base from which he approaches the issue."

3. "Accept decisions made within the "rules of the game" even though he deems them unwise (i.e., the decision has been made rationally by informed persons, acting within their authority, and attempting to be fair and reasonable)."

4. "Recognize that he may be required to defend a decision which he personally rejects, if it has been made according to the rules of the game, if it falls properly within his official role and cognizance, without volunteering his contrary views; but that he is not required under any circumstances to testify falsely as to the facts or as to his personal judgment."

5. "Recognize that the rules of the game permit him to contest a decision made by his own organization, but not yet final, by going over his superior's head, or by going to other organizations within the government (including the legislative branch) only when he can honestly assure himself (1) that a mistake is being made on an issue of major public importance, (2) that his judgment is unbiased by personal or partisan, as opposed to public, interest considerations, (3) that the risk he runs of being forced out of the government is justified by the importance of the issue, and (4) that what will be lost by the decision outweighs the value of his probable future usefulness to the government if he continues in the government."

6. "Resign if he cannot accept valid interpretations of the law by higher administrative authorities which would control his action (where the interpretation of the law has not been determined judicially)."

7. "Assuming that a decision or plan of action is final and that its legality is not in doubt, an administrator is obligated if it falls within his sphere of responsibility to carry out the action to the best of his ability, in good faith, whether or not he agrees with the merits of the decision."

8. "Assuming that a decision or plan of action is final, but that its legality is in doubt and is being contested, the administrator (insofar as it is within his sphere of responsibility) may "go slow" until the legality is determined."

9. "The alternatives in either case are to ask for transfer to other duties not involved in the action in question, or to resign."

Graham identifies two principles underlying all ethical conduct. One is that all public managers are bound by the law. Wherever, he suggests, there is discretion in interpretation and implementation, the manager is obligated to use power in good faith in the public interest. The second principle is that public managers do not "own" the government or their public organizations and, consequently, the administrator role is that of trustee rather than proprietor. The utility of these guidelines for ethical behavior exists in their application to the situational dilemmas presented in the earlier activities. The reader should make the application.

There are other approaches to ethical problems which rely less on prescriptive guides for behavior and more on methodological techniques for the manager's use in deriving an appropriate ethical response. Stephen Bailey and Harlan Cleveland have suggested two such techniques.

Bailey has written about the really tough decisional problems which plague political and administrative officers, drawing on his experience as mayor of an Eastern city. For Bailey, the hard ethical cases were not the attempted bribery for favored treatment or political influence on zoning or other matters. The hard ones dealt with conflicting rights and desires of many citizen groups. The tough questions were like these: Is the quiet and privacy of a neighborhood more valuable than a pet owner's hobby and partial livelihood (peacocks)?; How much evidence of wrongdoing should one require before initiating a departmental investigation of a twenty year veteran employee that will deter efficiency and morale and possibly public confidence (and consider that the little existing evidence may only be a rumor placed by a crank)?; Wholesale purchases outside the city will save money for the citizens and the city, perhaps one cent per annum per capita, but will cost ten dollars or more in income for each of twenty small store merchants--which purchasing pattern better serves the public interest?

Bailey recites twelve of these trade-off questions as the ethical puzzlers of his mayoral experience. The most useful yardstick he found to aid in the resolution of these ethical quandaries was the question "What do you want Middletown to be like ten years from now?" Of course, interpretation and choice is still required of the individual. It is not easy to determine which of two or more alternatives in questions like those posed above are the most directly contributive of the long-range projection of a desired community. In addition, many dichotomized, either-or questions can really be found to have multiple dimensional characteristics which even further compound the decision. Nevertheless, the projection toward the future is offered by Bailey as the most singely useful method he found.

Harlan Cleveland presents another question which the public manager can pose for himself when puzzled over the propriety of a particular decision. Cleveland suggests that the ultimate judgment about the quality of managerial performance belongs to the citizens and that the best way to measure those actions is to be sure that they are known publicly. "The best antidote," he says, "to irresponsibility is openness."

We saw earlier that Cleveland finds ethical systems differing among all people. In this situation, he says that no written code of ethics can ever be "comprehensive enough or subtle enough to be a satisfactory guide to personal behavior." Lacking a

satisfactory guide to behavior, Cleveland suggests the question for each manager to pose, "If this action is held up to public scrutiny, will I still feel that it is what I should have done, and how I should have done it?"

Once again, the major responsibility is left with the decision maker. The public in its immediate passions does not always represent the wisdom that time and reflective consideration provide. In addition, when public outrage is felt or even imagined by the public manager, it is not necessarily all or even a balanced opinion of the public that is heard. The "squeaking wheel" syndrome works in more ways than one. Public managers, it seems, must apply the tools of ethical decision making with just as much care as they give to the substance of the quandary itself.

The personal decision making arena for the public manager is clearly a complex one. There is no escaping the necessity of confronting and resolving tough and problematical dilemmas. It might be said, of course, that this arena of tough choices is the essential defining component of the manager's responsibility, but the saying does not ease the task.

There may be, however, a few clues to greater confidence about ethical quandaries. One is that there are actually more options for taking the "right" action that we normally think about. We often approach an ethical dilemma with the idea that we must either "do what he says" or get fired. This either-or attitude often appears to deter our examining the situation for other possible action steps. We make assumptions not necessarily verified about the supposed behavior of others given an action of ours and, consequently, miss the possibility of ordering a number of action possibilities from gentle or least costly to dramatic or more costly. Sharing our dilemma with trusted colleagues, for instance, should be a low cost of high potential benefit which many of us often neglect.

A second area of confidence is the possibility of existing and future structural innovations in organizations that will provide greater rewards and incentives for ethical behavior than have generally been available in the past.

It is often not recognized that the law and organizational procedures may be consistent with the individual's perception of ethical position. We may know the law or the organizationally prescribed procedure, for example, but we do not necessarily perceive or believe that the formal rules can effectively counter the hierarchical power of politicians or administrators. The difference between knowing and believing is important. There are more options for sustaining ethical performance than we often realize, and we ought more frequently to use these formal powers.

In a similar connection, it may well be that higher executives would be more responsive to persistent, firm and strategic (that is, supportive rather than adversarial) interventions on behalf of the ethical stance than we commonly assume. We ought to verify those possibilities before initiating more dramatic and disruptive options on the one hand or forgetting the issue on the other.

In addition to public laws and organizational procedures, grievance procedures and union representation are increasingly available and might be used more often than presently when the less formal and less disruptive channels have proven unsuccessful.

More and more organizations are adopting ombudsman-like roles for expanding appeal mechanisms. Structural options which increase openness in implementing and reviewing organizational practices are increasingly available and useful in encouraging ethical behavior. A wider sharing of organizational data with the public and with the members of the organization, and more generally inclusive evaluations of organization executives including subordinate and peer contributions are examples of openness features.

Progress in meeting the challenge of ethical behavior in public organizations ultimately rests on the commitment of individual members to strive for greater ethical performance. Progress can be made by first seeking an understanding of the reality and complexity of ethical dilemmas, secondly enhancing the personal conviction that something useful can and should be done, and lastly supporting and enlarging the personal commitment to action toward accomplishing more ethically rewarding behavior. This stance, of course, leaves the question of what is the ethical act directly in the hands of the actor--perhaps a rather tenuous and unsettling posture for many of us. For the present, however, it may represent one effective step forward in improving the quality of ethical performance in the public service.

D. References

Stephen Bailey, "Ethics and the Politican," The Center Magazine Vol. I, No. 5(1968) pp. 63-70.

Stephen Bailey, "Ethics and the Public Service," Public Administration Review, Vol. XXIV, No. 4 (Dec. 1969), pp. 234-243.

Harlan Cleveland, "Executive Feet to the Fire," The Future Executive, N. Y. Harper & Row, 1972, pp. 99-120.

"Ethics in Local Government,"
Public Management, Vol. 57, No. 6
(June 1975) pp. 2-19.

George Graham, "Ethical Guidelines for Public Administrators:
Observation on Rules of the Game,"
Public Administration Review, Vol. 34,
No. 1 (Jan/Feb 1974) pp. 90-92.

ACTIVITY FIVE

Time: Approximately two hours.

A Decisional Strategy for Ethical Quandaries

A. Instructions

1. Use one or more of the cases in the Appendix, or use cases contributed by the participants. The use of an individual case for each group is preferable, and it is helpful to have the author of an ethical quandary as an active member of the group. The personally experienced ethical dilemma provides greater realism and comprehension than externally provided cases. Of course, personal cases should only be used when the author is willing to and comfortable in doing so.

This exercise can be done individually, but group consideration will generally add an important creative and balancing dimension.

2. In groups of approximately five, use the Decisional Analysis form on page 35 to analyze a case by:

a) listing as many different actions the person confronted by the dilemma could take (use a brainstorming approach that does not at this stage evaluate the possibilities or utility of varying alternatives);

b) projecting the possible consequences of each of those actions;

c) listing the objectives or values to be sought as a part of any successful action(s) chosen (Item III); and,

d) recommending an action or sequence of actions that might be taken.

3. In plenary session, a representative should present the considerations and recommendations of each group followed by questions and discussion.

4. Discussion questions--It is expected that every participant's perception of available options for action will have been enlarged during the course of this exercise. Does your experience confirm the expectation? Is there any practical learning to be derived from this exercise for application in your personal organizational life?

B. Decisional Analysis for Ethical Quandary

List in left column as many alternative actions you can think of.	List in right column the possible consequences of each alternative
1. _____	_____
	_____
	_____
	_____
	_____
2. _____	_____
	_____
	_____
	_____
	_____
3. _____	_____
	_____
	_____
	_____
	_____
4. _____	_____
	_____
	_____
	_____
	_____
5. _____	_____
	_____
Use reverse for additional alternatives.	_____
	_____

List several desired consequences to be sought in whatever action(s) are chosen	Recommended action or sequence of actions
_____	1. _____
_____	2. _____
_____	3. _____
_____	4. _____
_____	5. _____

ACTIVITY SIX

A Personal Case Analysis

A. The participant should write a personal case of an ethical dilemma in which the essential features of the situation are identified and in which the conflict felt by the person in the "eye" of the dilemma is clearly illuminated.

It should be a situation which the participant personally has encountered or one of which the participant has personal knowledge. Preferably, it is drawn from some public organizational experience.

The action taken or actual result should be omitted. In other words, the case description ends ideally with the phrase, "What should I do?"

The second section of the Case Analysis should analyze the case and the options for action, preferably by use of the Decisional Analysis concept used in Activity Five. Include a listing of the basic values or outcomes to be achieved in any action, and a recommended action or actions. A post-assessment at this point in the analysis of whatever actually transpired is appropriate, assuming the case is from the past.

A third section should be a personal sketch of an individualized code of ethics--an attempt to draw together for you at this point in time an approach which you believe to be an appropriate guide to ethical behavior choices in your present and future organizational life.

Depending on the length of time available for individualized work, this Case Analysis might vary from three or four to fifteen or twenty typewritten equivalent pages.

B. In groups of five to seven, share the personal cases and analyses to whatever extent the participants are willing. (Anonymity and privacy should be guaranteed, even to the point of sharing with the instructor or workshop leader unless this module is part of a credit course)

C. In a plenary session, the most challenging of the Personal Case Analyses should be presented and discussed as time permits.

D. In a wrap-up plenary session, participants may share their conclusions regarding dilemmas in public managerial ethics and their own personal ethical codes. This is also the time to raise whatever questions seem to have been unanswered and to explore possible resources for extended examination and learning about the problems of ethical behavior in the public service.

ACTIVITY SEVEN

A Post-Session Evaluation

A. Immediate Feedback

1. The seminar leader may wish to take a few minutes before adjournment of the last session to solicit general comments and reactions to the focus and conduct of the managerial ethics seminar.

2. The seminar leader may wish to collect some written comments based on the just concluded experience, asking for reactions about the most useful activities, and the sense of accomplishment of the original goals for the seminar.

B. Reflective Feedback

1. The participants are to be encouraged to write a diary reflection on the experience of each day or session of the seminar. Ideally, of course, this should be done on the same day as the session was held.

2. Three to five days after completion of the seminar, the participants should review the pre-session evaluation statements to determine if

a) they would change or expand the previous answers in any way; and,

b) they sense any personal accomplishment around the seminar's goals of increasing understanding of the complexity of ethical issues and enlarging the range of believable options for ethical behavior.

3. Write an evaluation of your experience with the seminar, including:

a) your sense of engagement with the stated goals;

b) your sense of positive personal learning about the issues of ethical behavior in the public service;

c) the more useful parts of the experience;

d) the least useful parts of the experience;

e) your recommendations for more effective conduct of similar seminars in the future.

4. Your personal evaluations should be returned to some sponsoring person or authority rather than to the seminar leaders, if possible.

Appendix A

SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

Paul Appleby, Morality and Administration in Democratic Government LSU Press, 1952.

DeWitt Armstrong and George Graham, "Ethical Preparation for the Public Service: The 1970s," The Bureaucrat 4, 1 April 1975 5-23.

Kurt Baier and N. Rescher, eds. Values and the Future, Free Press Paperback, 1969.

Paul Douglas, Ethics in Government, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1952.

George England, et.al., The Manager and the Man: A Cross Cultural Study of Personal Values, Kent State University Press, 1974.

George England, The Manager and His Values, Ballinger, 1976.

Albert Jonsen and Lewis Butler, "Public Ethics and Policy Making," Hastings Center Report #5, August 1975, pp. 19-31.

Abraham Kaphan, American Ethics and Public Policy, Oxford University Press, 1963.

Kenneth Kernaghan, Ethical Conduct: Guidelines for Government Employees, Toronto, Institute of Public Administration of Canada, 1975.

Wayne Leys, Ethics for Policy Decision, Prentice Hall, 1952.

Frederick Mosher, et. al., Watergate: Implications for Responsible Government, Basic Books, 1972.

John Rohr, "The Study of Ethics in the P.A. Curriculum," Public Administration Review, 36, 4 (July/August 1976) 398-406.

Milton Rokeach, The Nature of Human Values, The Free Press, 1973.

Susan Wakefield, "Ethics and the Public Service: A Case for Individual Responsibility," Public Administration Review, 36, 6 (Nov/Dec. 1976) 661-666.

Edward Weisband and Thomas M. Franck, Resignation in Protest, Grossman Publishers, 1975.

Appendix B

Some Illustrative Cases

All of the cases below were submitted as actual experiences by participants in Ethics Workshops similar to that outlined in this module.

Case No. 1. Graber Street, at a well known U. S. Air Force base, was paved in the 1930's with eight inch concrete with curbs. The installation was very substantial as well as maintenance free. In the 1960's the concrete was paved over with asphalt in order to reduce noise resulting from vehicular traffic passing over the joints in the concrete. The noise disappeared but water began to back up at all intersections due to the higher asphalt surface. Standing water deteriorated the asphalt surface creating high maintenance costs. Shortly, the joints in the concrete "reflected" up through the asphalt and joint noise was added to the drainage and maintenance problems.

To correct the situation, the asphalt was removed to the original concrete surface, leaving some asphalt stains which would have worn away with time. Officers from the Base Commander's staff did not like the looks of the stains and applied pressure for reasphalting the street. A new contract proposal for reasphalting was sent forward to SAC Headquarters, but was rejected on grounds that funds had just been approved for removing the asphalt. Staff officers are putting pressure on the Base Civil Engineer to divert the use of regularly appropriated supply funds (Approximately $35,000.00) to accomplish the work. You are the Base Civil Engineer. What should you do? (You may assume that you have not been ordered either directly or indirectly to do this by the Base Commander, but that you are being pressured by senior staff officers next in command to the Commander.)

Case No. 2. Three colleagues known for their commitment to the goals of the organization and for accomplishing significant tasks toward those goals resign in the midst of one of their most important undertakings, issuing a press release charging that the public agency they served has compromised the public interest and will be less vigorous in its regulatory activities in the future. As press spokesman for the Agency you must provide the official reaction to these charges. You are aware that some weeks earlier the three had arranged for office space for a firm which they intend to establish and that they have been contacted by a TV network for an interview as well as by three Congressional committees who may hold hearings. You also wish that more vigorous regulatory action was

politically feasible but you recognize that the Agency is constrained by external forces, a factor that was secondarily attacked by the resignees. You believe that some of the procedural problems they criticize were of their own making. Their on-going project is jeopardized by their hasty departure and you sense that a cause for their action may well have been a reorganization that took place weeks earlier. They could have made known their intention to leave at that time--approximately the same time they leased their offices. Do you praise them, damn them, or damn them with faint praise?

Case No. 3. The chemist in your district environmental enforcement office has played golf every Saturday for the past two months with an industry official. Your agency has recently taken this industry to court on an enforcement action, and this chemist's testimony was not hard on the industry. Hear-say in the office is that the chemist's subordinates have said that he jumbled the water sample data a little to favor the industry. You are the manager of this district office. What should you do?

Case No. 4. You are the personnel manager of a small governmental jurisdiction. You have been included in a three member team from the administrative staff (yourself, the budget officer, and one representative from your political council) to meet and confer in good faith with a professional category of employees in your jurisdiction to determine salary, benefits, and working conditions for that group of employees.

After an extended series of negotiations, your team has agreed to a compromise plan presented by the professional group. You, personally, in that session articulated your team's agreement. Three days after your team's oral agreement to the compromise plan, the Associate Administrator of your jurisdiction calls the other two members of your team together (you are temporarily out of town) to indicate that the jurisdiction cannot possibly accept the compromise plan to which you and your team had agreed in the negotiating sessions. (Note: The sessions up to this point had not been taped nor had official minutes been recorded.) The Administrator of the jurisdiction has been out of town for nearly a month and is not due back for another week.

The Associate Administrator, with the agreement of the budget officer and the political member, suggests a strategy by which your team would deny that you had in fact agreed to the compromise plan and would insist that the professional group must have misinterpreted the intentions and the words of your team.

At the negotiating session, this strategy is presented under the leadership of the budget officer. Despite the recognition by the professional group of a deliberate change in position and despite their

accurate restatement of your specific words at the last meeting in agreeing to the compromise plan, the professional group fails to confront you directly with whether or not their restatement is accurate. Although you have already indicated to your team members your disagreement with the strategy chosen, you silently go along during this session with the decision of the other members of your team.

Your conscience, however, bothers you as you believe that negotiating in good faith is very important to future effective operations in your jurisdiction, and that this particular strategy represents a "bad faith" negotiation which in your opinion has become increasingly a strategy of the administrators in this jurisdiction.

After losing sleep and suffering considerable internal turmoil, you are confronted with both the return of the Administrator and an upcoming negotiating session at which the professional group might more directly challenge you personally regarding your original commitment to the compromise plan. You know now that the Administrator agrees with the Associate Administrator that the original agreement to the compromise plan was "impossible" for the jurisdiction to accept. You also realize the Administrator normally tends to back up the Associate Administrator once a position has been taken on any matter.

What do you do now?

Case No. 5.

SCENE: A unit supervisor and five of his staff members are on their way to a staff meeting. At this meeting other unit supervisors and staffs, an area coordinator, and top management will be represented. Top management has proposed some policy and organizational changes which the staff opposes. The staff elected to have their supervisors present a position paper to management explaining their opposition to the changes. On the way up to the meeting on the elevator, the following conversation takes place between the supervisor and his staff:

Staff Member #1: Who is going to present the position paper in the meeting this afternoon?

Supervisor: "Bob Lockland was going to do it, but the area coordinator informed us only a couply of hours ago that top management is very anxious for these changes, and that failure to support top management on this will be disasterous for any objectives or projects we hope to have approved in the near future. It is politically unwise for any unit head to oppose these changes if he wants to maintain an effective relationship with management. So we've abandoned the presentation."

Staff Member #1: "But management doesn't have all the facts about the problems this will cause. They should at least be aware that their staff has serious reservations!"

Supervisor: "If any of you would like to address the matter on behalf of non-supervisory personnel or yourself, you may do so, and you may count on my support for your right to present your point of view."

Staff Member #2: "It wouldn't do any good; management's already made up their minds what they are going to do. They don't give a damn what we think."

Staff Member #3: "I've got a wife and two children to support. I can't afford to risk losing my job over a matter of principle. I'd like to see management get the information, but I'm not going to be the one to do it. I don't need the headaches, and I don't want to jeopardize my career.

Staff Member #4: "It isn't our responsibility to make policy. We're just supposed to carry it out. Management may be right after all. Personally, I was never sure a position paper was a good idea in the first place. Besides, I'd never try to speak for our group. If someone else wants to speak up, that's their business."

Staff Member #5: "Let's be smart about this and drop the whole thing. If management wants these changes, we should support them. There will be other policy issues. We should only support those on which we know we stand a chance of gaining management support."

Staff Member #1: "Then none of you is really willing to support your original position on these changes after all?"

SILENCE BY ALL.

Case No. 6. You are Public Health Administrator (M.D.) in an outlying area. You know that a certain obstretician has repeatedly made poor judgments in his practice resulting in many birth injuries and cases of mental retardation. It is widely known that the obstretician has a heavy drinking habit.

You are in a position to initiate an investigation for public protection--but he, the obstretician, is also the Chairman of the Board of Medical Reviewers within the region and can probably make it uncomfortable for your in your position as Director of the Board of Health. (For we all know that a Board of Health probably isn't perfect at any one point in time.)

Case No. 7. Two years ago I had a partner at work who became a good friend. My partner lived just three blocks from my home. One day I got a call from my friend's wife. She wanted to know if her husband and I had been out drinking the night before. I answered, "of course". The next day my partner told me he spent the night with a girl he met.

The next few months his wife kept calling me checking on her husband. I didn't enjoy being in the middle. What should I have done? Get a new partner? Tell my partner's wife the truth? Or moved? Or what?

Case No 8. The Police Department's Juvenile Unit is in a bad way. The unit consists of four male officers with four to ten years of experience, and one female officer with two years experience. The male officers have come into the unit within the past year; the female officer was placed in the juvenile unit eighteen months ago, after only three months in beat patrol service.

The woman officer is having an "out-front" affair with the captain who is in charge of the Investigation Division, of which the Juvenile Unit is a part. She is given the cases to assign to the male officers by the Division Sergeant. The male officers are assigned all of the cases requiring investigation and street follow-up, while the female retains for herself only the missing juvenile cases and other matters that require only phone calls and minimal street time.

The male officers have approached the sergeant about the case assignment inequities and the generally "bossy" attitude of the female. He has put-off the matter, but it is well known that he "worships" the Division Captain. (Both have advanced cases of "short-man syndrome".) The Captain is quite powerful and no other staff members (who are well aware of the Juvenile Unit problems) are willing to challenge him. The male juvenile officers have considered approaching the chief, but he is currently having a well-known affair with a twenty-four year old department secretary, and it is felt that he will not be receptive. It is also known around the department that the captain has some "good wood" on the chief from years past.

What are the male juvenile officers to do?